



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

October 11, 2006

Mr. James M. Frazier, III
Assistant General Counsel
Texas Department of Criminal Justice
P.O. Box 4004
Huntsville, Texas 77342-404

OR2006-11900

Dear Mr. Frazier:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under the Public Information Act (the "Act"), chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 261609.

The Texas Department of Criminal Justice (the "department") received two related requests from two requestors for "the top three bids" and for "the winning proposal" for a specified contract. Although you take no position on the proprietary nature of the information, you state and provide documentation showing that you have notified Johnson Controls, Inc. ("JCI"), Noresco, LLC ("Noresco"), and TAC Americas ("TAC") of the request and of their opportunity to submit comments to this office as to why the requested information should not be released to the requestor.¹ See Gov't Code § 552.305(d); see also Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (determining that statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain the applicability of exception to disclose under Act in certain circumstances). We have received correspondence on behalf of each of the third parties. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

In its brief dated August 30, 2006, Noresco asserts that a portion of its information is marked confidential as "reflected in an annotation on the title page of each document," and therefore

¹ We note that in your letter dated August 17, 2006, you have withdrawn your assertions under sections 552.101, 552.104, 552.107(1), 552.108, and 552.111 of the Government Code.

may not be disclosed. However, information is not confidential under the Act simply because the party submitting the information anticipates or requests that it be kept confidential. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 677 (Tex. 1976). In other words, a governmental body cannot, through an agreement or contract, overrule or repeal provisions of the Act. Attorney General Opinion JM-672 (1987); Open Records Decision Nos. 541 at 3 (1990) (“[T]he obligations of a governmental body under [the predecessor to the Act] cannot be compromised simply by its decision to enter into a contract.”); 203 at 1 (1978) (mere expectation of confidentiality by person supplying information does not satisfy requirements of statutory predecessor to section 552.110). Consequently, unless the information falls within an exception to disclosure, it must be released, notwithstanding any expectations or agreement specifying otherwise.

JCI, Noresco and TAC assert that portions of their information are excepted from disclosure under section 552.110 of the Government Code. Section 552.110 protects: (1) trade secrets, and (2) commercial or financial information the disclosure of which would cause substantial competitive harm to the person from whom the information was obtained. *See Gov’t Code* § 552.110(a)–(b). Section 552.110(a) protects the property interests of private parties by excepting from disclosure trade secrets obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision. *See id.* § 552.110(a). A “trade secret”

may consist of any formula, pattern, device or compilation of information which is used in one’s business, and which gives [one] an opportunity to obtain an advantage over competitors who do not know or use it. It may be a formula for a chemical compound, a process of manufacturing, treating or preserving materials, a pattern for a machine or other device, or a list of customers. It differs from other secret information in a business in that it is not simply information as to single or ephemeral events in the conduct of the business, as for example the amount or other terms of a secret bid for a contract or the salary of certain employees A trade secret is a process or device for continuous use in the operation of the business. Generally it relates to the production of goods, as for example, a machine or formula for the production of an article. It may, however, relate to the sale of goods or to other operations in the business, such as a code for determining discounts, rebates or other concessions in a price list or catalogue, or a list of specialized customers, or a method of bookkeeping or other office management.

RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939); *see also Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 763, 776 (Tex.); Open Records Decision Nos. 552 at 2 (1990), 255 (1980), 232 (1979), 217 (1978).

There are six factors to be assessed in determining whether information qualifies as a trade secret:

- (1) the extent to which the information is known outside of [the company's] business;
- (2) the extent to which it is known by employees and others involved in [the company's] business;
- (3) the extent of measures taken by [the company] to guard the secrecy of the information;
- (4) the value of the information to [the company] and to [its competitors];
- (5) the amount of effort or money expended by [the company] in developing this information; and
- (6) the ease or difficulty with which the information could be properly acquired or duplicated by others.

RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939); *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 319 (1982), 306 (1982), 255 (1980), 232 (1979). This office must accept a claim that information subject to the Act is excepted as a trade secret if a *prima facie* case for exemption is made and no argument is submitted that rebuts the claim as a matter of law. Open Records Decision No. 552. However, we cannot conclude that section 552.110(a) is applicable unless it has been shown that the information meets the definition of a trade secret and the necessary factors have been demonstrated to establish a trade secret claim. Open Records Decision No. 402 (1983).

After reviewing the submitted information and the arguments of JCI, Noresco and TAC, we find that JCI, Noresco and TAC have made a *prima facie* case that some of the information at issue is protected as trade secret information. We have marked the information in the submitted documents which the department must withhold pursuant to section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. However, we determine that JCI, Noresco, and TAC have failed to demonstrate that any portion of the remaining submitted information meets the definition of a trade secret, nor have these companies demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim for this information. We therefore determine that no portion of the remaining submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.110(a).

Section 552.110(b) protects “[c]ommercial or financial information for which it is demonstrated based on specific factual evidence that disclosure would cause substantial competitive harm to the person from whom the information was obtained[.]” Gov’t Code § 552.110(b). This exception to disclosure requires a specific factual or evidentiary showing, not conclusory or generalized allegations, that substantial competitive injury would likely result from release of the information at issue. Gov’t Code § 552.110(b); *see also National Parks & Conservation Ass’n v. Morton*, 498 F.2d 765 (D.C. Cir. 1974).

Upon review of the submitted briefs and information, we find that JCI, Noresco and TAC have failed to provide specific factual evidence demonstrating that release of the remaining submitted information would result in substantial competitive harm to each company. Accordingly, we determine that no portion of the information at issue is excepted from disclosure under section 552.110(b). *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 661 (1999) (for information to be withheld under commercial or financial information prong of section 552.110, business must show by specific factual evidence that substantial competitive injury would result from release of particular information at issue), 509 at 5 (1988) (because costs, bid specifications, and circumstances would change for future contracts, assertion that release of bid proposal might give competitor unfair advantage on future contracts is too speculative), 319 at 2 (1982) (finding information relating to organization, personnel, market studies, professional references, qualifications, experience, and pricing not excepted under section 552.110). Furthermore, we note that the pricing information of a winning bidder is generally not excepted under section 552.110(b). This office considers the prices charged in government contract awards to be a matter of strong public interest. *See* Open Records Decision No. 514 (1988) (public has interest in knowing prices charged by government contractors). *See generally* Freedom of Information Act Guide & Privacy Act Overview, 219 (2000) (federal cases applying analogous Freedom of Information Act reasoning that disclosure of prices charged government is a cost of doing business with government). We therefore conclude that none of the remaining information subject to section 552.022 is excepted from disclosure under section 552.110(b).

We note that the remaining information includes a bank account number.² Section 552.136 states that “[n]otwithstanding any other provision of this chapter, a credit card, debit card, charge card, or access device number that is collected, assembled, or maintained by or for a governmental body is confidential.” Gov’t Code § 552.136. Accordingly, the department must withhold the bank account number we have marked pursuant to section 552.136.

Finally, we note that a portion of the submitted information is protected by copyright. A custodian of public records must comply with the copyright law and is not required to furnish copies of records that are copyrighted. Attorney General Opinion JM-672 (1987). A governmental body must allow inspection of copyrighted materials unless an exception applies to the information. *Id.* If a member of the public wishes to make copies of copyrighted materials, the person must do so unassisted by the governmental body. In making copies, the member of the public assumes the duty of compliance with the copyright law and the risk of a copyright infringement suit. *See* Open Records Decision No. 550 (1990).

² The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

In summary, the department must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. The department must also withhold the bank account number we have marked pursuant to section 552.136 of the Government Code. The remaining submitted information must be released to the requestors. In releasing those portions of the submitted information that are protected by copyright, the department must comply with copyright law.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, upon receiving this ruling, the governmental body will either release the public records promptly pursuant to section 552.221(a) of the Government Code or file a lawsuit challenging this ruling pursuant to section 552.324 of the Government Code. If the governmental body fails to do one of these things, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Office of the Attorney General at (512) 475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,



Amy L.S. Shipp
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

ALS/sdk

Ref: ID# 261609

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Caitlin Mitchell
2877 Ridgedale Drive
Lewisville, Texas 75067
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Judy Breese
3504 Lost Oasis Holw
Austin, Texas 78739
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Charles K. McGinnis
National Director State Government Solutions
Johnson Controls, Inc.
2400 Kilgust Road
Madison, Wisconsin 53713
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Klip Weaver
Account Representative
TAC Americas
1650 West Crosby Road
Carrollton, Texas 75006
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Frank C. DeGuire, Jr.
Group Counsel
Johnson Controls, Inc.
P.O. Box 423
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53201-0423
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Theresa A. MacKinnon
Manager, Legal Services
Noresco
1701 West Northwest Highway
Grapevine, Texas 76051
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. John H. Taylor
Group Director SW
Noresco, LLC
1701 West Northwest Highway
Grapevine, Texas 76051
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Patricia L. Stein
Canterbury, Stuber, Elder, Gooch & Surratt
5005 LBJ Freeway, Suite 1000
Dallas, Texas 75244
(w/o enclosures)